

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s): M.A. Brodie et al.
Docket No.: YOR920040093US1
Serial No.: 10/826,575
Filing Date: April 16, 2004
Group: 2154
Examiner: Haresh N. Patel

Title: Active Probing for Real-Time Diagnosis

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following remarks are submitted in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance included in the Notice of Allowability, dated March 31, 2008, in the above-referenced application.


REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance (hereinafter "Statement") given on page 3 of the Notice of Allowability, dated March 31, 2008. Based on this review, it appears that certain aspects of the Statement may be viewed as mischaracterizing the scope of the allowed claims.

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 23 recites limitations which are not taught in the prior art of record, specifically, "A computer-implemented method for diagnosing a problem associated with a computing system, the method comprising the steps of: executing one or more probes in accordance with at least a portion of a previously selected probe schedule for active probing; when a result of one or more of the probes of the previously selected probe schedule indicates, at least, a potential problem associated with the computing system, selecting in real-time one or more probes which optimize at least one criterion, wherein the step of selecting in real-time one or more probes which optimize at least one criterion further comprises the step of selecting in real-time one or more probes which maximize information gain relating to the potential problem; executing the one or more selected probes so as to diagnose the potential problem; analyzing results of the execution of the one or more selected probes using a probabilistic inference and using one or more prior fault probabilities for one or more system components; wherein prior to the execution of the probes, a problem detection probe set (DPS) and a problem localization probe set (LPS) are preselected, wherein probes of the DPS are intended to cover any given problem and probes of the LPS are intended to localize a problem detected by a probe of the DPS; and repeating the step of selecting in real-time one or more probes which optimize at least one criterion and the step of analyzing results of the execution of the one or more selected probes until a particular level of diagnostic confidence is reached."

In summary, Applicants believe that claim 23 is allowable because the particular limitations thereof are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. To the extent that the Statement includes language which does not accurately reflect the claim limitations, the Statement is respectfully traversed.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William E. Lewis". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "William" being more prominent.

William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946

Date: April 29, 2008